



**SCOTTSDALE AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMISSION
PUBLIC MEETING
Scottsdale Airport Terminal Lobby
15000 N. Airport Drive, Scottsdale, AZ**

October 8, 2014

MINUTES

PRESENT: Steve Ziomek, Chairman
Ken Casey, Vice Chairman
Brad Berry
John Celigoy
Michael Goode
Bob Hobbi
William Schuckert

STAFF: Sarah Ferrara, Aviation Planning & Outreach Coordinator
Shannon Johnson, Management Analyst
Gary Mascaro, Aviation Director
Chris Read, Airport Operations Manager
Greg Bloemberg, Senior Planner

GUESTS: Irene Clary, Catclar Investments
Tom George
Jim Harris, Coffman Associates, Inc.
Beth Holliday, Noise Expert
Eddie Ochoa
Wendy Riddell, Berry, Riddell, Rosensteel
Fred Taylor
Michael Wareing, Decca Builders
Michael Zajas, Catclar Investments

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Ziomek called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

A formal roll call confirmed the presence of all Commissioners, as noted above.

At the invitation of Chairman Ziomek, Commissioner Berry introduced himself. He has lived in Scottsdale for 38 years and learned to fly about six years ago.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Ziomek led the meeting in the pledge of allegiance.

AVIATION DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Gary Mascaro, Aviation Director, said there was no report this month.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Approval of Minutes

Regular Meeting: September 10, 2014

Vice-Chairman Casey made a motion to approve the minutes of the September 10, 2014 regular meeting. Commissioner Goode seconded the motion, which carried by a unanimous vote of seven (7) to zero (0).

PUBLIC COMMENT

No members of the public wished to address the Commission.

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS 1 - 5

1. Discussion and Possible Action to Recommend Approval of Cases 6-GP-2014 and 14-ZN-2014 (Bahia Work/Live)

Aviation Planning & Outreach Coordinator Ms. Sarah Ferrara explained that this is before the Commission because Chapter 5 of the Scottsdale Revised Code regulates development in the vicinity of the Airport. The Commission is to review the project and make a recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council.

Senior Planner Mr. Greg Bloemberg noted that there is both a zoning and a General Plan case. Two non major General Plan amendments are requested: One is to the 2001 General Plan, the other is to the Greater Airpark Character Area Plan. An amendment is also needed to the Horseman's Park Planned Community District zoning case. Finally, a zoning district map amendment is also requested to rezone from industrial park I-1 PCD to Planned Airpark Core Development District, Airpark mixed use residential. He noted that the Applicant has revised their height request, which is now at 65 feet including rooftop appurtenances.

Ms. Irene Clary of Catclar Investments presented the application. They propose 78 units comprising townhomes which will be zoned commercial with ancillary residential and a four story loft commercial building which will have some retail on the main floor. She explained that work live commercial is a use with ancillary residential use. The commercial use may have employees and may generate pedestrian and vehicular traffic. She distributed information on the aviation easement and the CC&Rs for the project to the Commissioners.

Ms. Beth Holliday of Noise Expert Acoustical Consulting, discussed the noise study she conducted.

Commissioner Celigoy commented that the noise study was done at five feet above ground level and inquired if that is typical. Ms. Holliday said that is the standard, although some residents will be living 40 feet above ground level (AGL). Commissioner Celigoy asked whether noise levels would be greater at 40 feet AGL. Ms. Holliday agreed that they probably would.

Commissioner Hobbi asked about the timing of the sample. Ms. Holliday said they took a 24-hour sample on September 15. They had spoken with Ms. Ferrara, who told them this was a typical day.

Chairman Ziomek commented that the rooftop patios at 60 feet AGL may be much noisier. Ms. Holliday said she could calculate the potential noise levels. Mr. Michael Zajas of Catclar Investments interjected that the noise study showed that motor traffic was the loudest noise, which is louder at ground level than higher up. The residential units will be at 30 to 40 feet AGL. The rooftop patios will not be at 65 feet.

Chairman Ziomek noted that the air traffic during the noise study was mostly using runway 2-1. However runway 3 is closer to the site. Commissioner Goode pointed out that departures are louder than arrivals and opined there would be noise issues.

Ms. Clary clarified that they plan a number of noise attenuation measures in the construction so the inside of the development will be quiet at every level. This is a commercial development that will attract younger urban people who are less concerned about noise.

Chairman Ziomek asked Mr. Bloemberg about the zoning. Mr. Bloemberg said that the Applicant is requesting Airpark Core Zoning, which is mixed use.

Chairman Ziomek opened the public commentary.

Mr. Michael Wareing, owner of Decca Builders, is working with the development team. They have increased the STC ratings which will help attenuate the noise for this project.

Mr. Fred Taylor who works for Jet Pros said he supports the project. Departures from runway 3 going south would fly over the project, but he said that particular traffic is minimal.

Mr. Eddie Ochoa, who works for Jet Pros, is a retired FAA aviation safety inspection with 22 years' experience. He has looked at this project and sees no safety issues associated with it.

Mr. Tom George has 8800 square feet of condominium space directly across from the project and he feels this will be a great addition to the area, providing full-time residents in an area that

is otherwise vacated at night. Additionally it will provide lunch at a convenient location and overall should enhance property values.

Commissioner Celigoy said he was curious as to why both runways were not observed, opining that about half of the data might be missing from the study. Ms. Holliday said if more needs to be done they can look at doing that.

Ms. Wendy Riddell of Berry, Riddell and Rosensteel clarified that the study was conducted at the proposed development site. Commissioner Hobbi explained that the data from one of the runways is missing. Departures from runway 3 are louder at the site than arrivals to runway 2-1. Ms. Riddell replied that they understood the flight traffic to be a typical busy Monday in September. Commissioner Hobbi argued that they cannot have a complete data set without studying both runways.

Commissioner Goode added that traffic in September is still in the low season. Activity increases in October and November and is at its peak in December through March. He concurred with the other Commissioners that takeoffs from runway 3 generate more noise. He asked Mr. Mascaro whether flight paths could change to a right turn out to avoid the mountains. Mr. Mascaro confirmed that flight paths could not be changed.

Commissioner Goode pointed out that Barcelona and the Impact Church apartments are all rental properties and were approved with a stipulation that they could never be converted to condominiums. He questioned whether young people could afford \$300,000 to \$400,000 for a condo and suggested making this project rental. When people own property they are more likely to complain about noise. When they are just renting they are able to move easily if the noise is unacceptable.

Ms. Riddell said there is a glut of apartments in Scottsdale, which is concerning. She said the younger demographic is less interested in traditional single family home ownership. However this product will appeal to them as there will be no yard maintenance and they will be living in an active vibrant area with many possibilities for entertainment and outdoor living. She emphasized that this is not a typical home for sale.

Mr. Zajas said that the sound attenuation will be of such a high standard that the risk of noise complaints will be minimized. In the past six months there have been no noise complaints from 1100 condominium units in this neighborhood. In the square mile of land where the project is located, no noise complaints had been logged in the last three years, which was the period they had checked. He agreed there is an oversupply of apartments, but this project is ahead of the cycle with an out of the box residential work/live development. Mr. Zajas stressed that the major source of noise during the noise study was cars. Inside the completed projected noise levels will be far lower.

Chairman Ziomek said this case is tough for him personally. He has lived a mile from the end of runway 2-1 for almost 40 years. The Commission's foremost role is to protect the Airport. He noted recent airport noise complaints featured in the Arizona Republic. This month's Smithsonian Air and Space Magazine has an eight-page article on Santa Monica Airport, which is in danger of being closed due to complaints about noise, jet fuel contamination, et cetera. He noted that from 1911 through 2006 there had been a total of 85 airports in Maricopa County. Although some were military airfields that were decommissioned, many closed due to complaints from the public.

Commissioner Schuckert said the Airport Advisory Commission's job is to protect the Airport and make recommendations to City Council that they can act upon. They should not exceed the authority or direction which they have been given. He noted that this project is outside of the 55 DNL. It appears to meet all of the City standards including the Greater Airpark Plan. The sound attenuation appears to exceed other projects. The aviation easement and the CC&Rs are in place to minimize the effects. Most runway 3 departures make a left turn away from the site. He agreed it is a tough question. However, he feels the application fulfills the requirements and he can support it.

Agreeing that this case is difficult, Commissioner Hobbi said he joined the Commission to protect the Airport. In his career in the aerospace industry he has seen encroachment on airports, leading in many cases to their eventual closure. However his concern is not because he is working in this industry. It is important to recognize that aviation is a pillar of the American economy. He understands the Applicant's vision of bringing businesses to the neighborhood and said the Commission must ensure that this economic activity does not eventually harm the Airport. The Commissioners are not anti-growth or anti-capitalism. The fundamental point is that today's decision may or may not have an impact on the Airport immediately, but when the Airport is entirely surrounded by development, people may decide that the Airport should be closed, which would harm the whole community. He appreciates everyone coming to the meeting and the amount of work that has gone into this project. He urged the Applicant to understand the Commission's perspective. For the future they must ensure the viability of the Airport. Apart from the people whose livelihood depends directly on the Airport, many others benefit from what the Airport does for the community. This is why the Commission is so challenged by this case.

Chairman Ziomek stated that emotionally he is opposed to this project for the same reasons as Commissioner Hobbi outlined. However because from the technical point of view everything the Applicant has done is within the requirements and they have met every regulation, he cannot say no.

Commissioner Schuckert made a motion to recommend approval of cases 6-GP-2014 and 14-ZN-2014, the Bahia Work/Live project. Chairman Ziomek seconded the motion.

Commissioner Goode commented that he agreed with Commissioner Schuckert and the Chairman. He feels torn but agreed that the Applicant has done everything possible to ensure that the future residents will not complain.

Vice Chair Casey thanked the Applicant for the diligent presentation and the time they had spent with the Commission. The project looks beautiful. He does have concerns about the residential condominium portion of the project. He cautioned that should the FAA at some point in the future change flight paths for eastbound VFR departures from runway 3, the project would be smack underneath the flight path. For that reason he cannot support this project.

Chairman Ziomek called for the vote. The vote carried by a vote of four (4) to three (3). Vice Chair Casey and Commissioners Celigoy and Hobbi dissented.

2. Discussion and Possible Action to Recommend to City Council Adoption of Resolution No. 9918, Authorizing Construction Bid Award No. 14PB038 to Danson Construction, LLC., the Lowest Responsive Bidder, in the Amount of \$3,968,000 for the Construction of the Airport Operations Center Building and Increase the Budget Authority for Aviation Capital Improvement Program Center No. A1201 from \$3,000,000 to \$4,900,000

Airport Operations Manager Mr. Chris Read described the building. The project will be entirely funded by Aviation Enterprise funds since this facility is not grant eligible. The current available cash balance in the Aviation Enterprise fund is approximately \$10.4 million. The building will be built to LEED Silver standards. Construction will take about ten months. The budget authority increase is being requested to account for additional construction costs and to fund all the aspects of the building including design, one percent public art contribution, ten percent for construction contingencies, construction administration, testing and utility installation. Design of the facility began in 2011. Construction costs have risen since that time as the economy recovered.

Mr. Read explained that once the building is completed, one hangar currently being used by maintenance staff for equipment storage will become available for rental. Mr. Mascaro added that the new facility is primarily for operations and maintenance. The Airport administrative staff will keep their offices in the Terminal Building.

Commissioner Goode made a motion to recommend approval of Resolution No. 9918, authorizing construction bid award No. 14PB038 to Danson Construction, LLC., the lowest responsive bidder, in the amount of \$3,968,000 for the construction of the Airport Operations Center Building and increase the budget authority for Aviation Capital Improvement Program Center No. A1201 from \$3,000,000 to \$4,900,000. Vice Chairman Casey seconded the motion, which carried by a vote of seven (7) to zero (0).

3. Discussion and Input Regarding Quarterly Noise Complaint Summary Report

Ms. Ferrara reported a 30 percent decrease in the total number of complaints received in the past quarter ended September 30. She confirmed that there were no complaints received from the area of La Bahia.

4. Discussion and Input Regarding the Update to the Airport Master Plan: Alternative Section

Mr. Mascaro said Airport staff had hosted a meeting of the Planning Advisory Committee the day before. They are working in coordination with the FAA. He thanked Commissioner Schuckert for participating in the Planning Advisory Committee.

Mr. Jim Harris and Mr. Matt Quick of Coffman Associates gave a presentation on the alternatives section for the updated Airport Master Plan. Mr. Harris noted that the Master Plan was last updated in 1997. The FAA recommendation is that master plans should be updated every five to ten years.

Mr. Quick reviewed the alternatives section. Based on operations he explained that aircraft in the D3 class are the critical design aircraft that operate at Scottsdale. These currently include Gulfstream II and Gulfstream IV, and some Learjets. The FAA classifications are based on the aircraft's approach speed as it comes in to land.

Mr. Quick discussed the design considerations, including the runway design code, the aircraft design group, the airport reference code and the approach and departure reference code. The approach and departure reference code is important because it deals with the current operational capabilities of the runway associated with the parallel taxiway system. Scottsdale's two parallel taxiways, Alpha and Bravo, are located 250 feet from the runway center line. This falls into the reference code B2 category. This information will be included on the Airport layout plan (ALP). As a D2 airport, Scottsdale's runway safety area (RSA) is 400 feet wide, 200 feet on either side of the runway center line. To meet the D3 standard, the RSA would be 500 feet wide, meaning the parallel taxiways would fall within the RSA, which the FAA will not permit.

Mr. Quick said the consultants did a detailed evaluation and analysis on the D3 standard and what it would take for the Airport to meet it. He displayed tables showing infrastructure to be relocated if the Airport were to go to the DC standard, including apron area, tie-downs, hangars, the wash rack, and the bypass taxiways. Adjacent property would have to be acquired.

In response to a question from Chairman Ziomek, Mr. Quick said that the alternatives chapter is a required part of the Master Plan. They are tasked with looking at the ramifications of meeting the D3 standard.

Vice Chairman Casey inquired about the procedure for when a G650 lands. Mr. Mascaro said there are currently no operational restrictions at the Airport. Commissioner Berry asked what the benefit would be to the Airport if they were to go to the D3 standard.

Mr. Quick stressed that Coffman Associates is not advocating for any position. He summarized that the separation for D3 is 400 feet. The separation for D2 is 300 feet. To achieve that standard some Airport infrastructure would have to be relocated. The Airport is currently listed as a D2 on the ALP, although they do not meet the 300-foot separation.

Mr. Quick said they can pursue a modification to standard with the FAA. Mr. Mascaro explained that the City placed a request for these modifications in 2000 but has never received an answer. This triggers a liability issue. One of the primary benefits of doing the Master Plan is to obtain an answer from the FAA. They have been discussing this issue with the FAA for a year.

Mr. Quick elaborated that in the most recent update to the advisory circular, the FAA now allows for a 400-foot wide RSA for the D2 standard, whereas in the past it was 500 feet wide. This means that the Airport has no RSA deficiencies. They are preparing proposed modifications to standards and working with the FAA. Mr. Harris added that the Master Plan has to provide the background as to why this can be done and also demonstrate how aircraft can operate safely.

Commissioner Celigoy asked about insurance. Mr. Mascaro said the Airport carries a \$300 million insurance policy. They want an answer from the FAA because if the answer were no, that would significantly change the Airport operations. Nonetheless the FAA did approve the ALP as a D2. Since 1999 the Airport has been asking for approval for the modifications, but the FAA has never replied. The FAA has approved the ALP on the condition that the Airport try to address the deficiencies.

Chairman Ziomek asked why keep pushing this question if the FAA has designated the Airport as a D2 and they have insurance. Mr. Harris said that when the FAA approved Scottsdale as a D2 airport, they approved the ALP but sent a list of standards deficiencies. The standard procedure would be for the Airport to then request a modification to the standards and for the FAA to sign off on that request.

Commissioner Celigoy commented that no airport is perfect. He opined that many airports must be in a similar situation. Mr. Quick agreed and said that the phrase "correct if practicable" is the key. At many airports the infrastructure is being outpaced by the size of aircraft using the facility. They are moving forward with the Master Plan, calling Scottsdale Airport a runway design code D2.

Runway pavement strength is tied into the discussions they have been having with the FAA over the past year. It is not practicable to meet the D3 standard of runway pavement strength. If the runway is strengthened to 100,000 pounds the FAA has said that the Airport must then meet the D3 standard. Given the infrastructure that would have to be relocated, and the low number of PPR requests that have been received, the Master Plan is moving forward with the concept of maintaining runway 321 at 75,000 pounds dual wheel load with the PPR program still in place.

In response to a query from Commissioner Goode, Mr. Mascaro said that the pavement is rated to 75,000 pounds. An overlay was done in 2010. Commissioner Goode said that the Airport must make sure that the pavement does not crumble under 100,000 pound aircraft. Mr. Mascaro pointed out that the runway is due for rehabilitation regardless. The engineers believe there is a need to completely remove and replace all layers of the runway pavement since this has never been done in the entire history of the Airport. The FAA has verbally stated that they will continue to help fund and maintain the pavement to the standard for 75,000 pound aircraft. The FAA also understands that there will be heavier activity through the PPR that could potentially deteriorate the pavement sooner than its life span of 20 years. His current best estimate of when the complete runway replacement might take place is in about three years' time. Working around the clock it would take about 30 days.

Commissioner Celigoy asked how much the PPR program shortens the life span of the runway pavement and how this is measured. Mr. Mascaro said the engineers did a pavement study and provided a formula. He noted that the heaviest aircraft arriving weigh a maximum of 75,000, so the 100,000 pound weight only applies to aircraft taking off fully fueled. Once a certain number of PPR operations have occurred, the staff is to visually inspect the pavement for signs of damage. They have not yet reached that threshold.

Mr. Quick discussed alternative changes to the taxiway geometry to improve safety according to the latest thinking of the FAA. The aim is to limit taxiways crossing runways at right angles. In discussions with the personnel at the control tower, the taxiways in question are key to Airport operations and efficiency, so the Airport will not necessarily eliminate these crossings. More information will be gathered before any proposals are made.

Vice Chair Casey suggested that the most critical area might be where planes touch down. Mr. Quick said those are important areas, but the FAA is most concerned about the high energy areas where aircraft are moving at maximum speed.

Mr. Quick outlined the new FAA standards which mean that potentially the displaced thresholds could be moved back to the physical end of the runway pavement and still meet the RSA standards. This would give additional landing distance for the aircraft. The Airport is a long way away from implementing any such change, but they looked at this question anyway.

Commissioner Celigoy pointed out that the berm by the Central Arizona Canal is a deficiency that would be impossible to correct. Mr. Quick said the FAA does grandfather some things into runway protection zones.

Mr. Quick stated that with respect to the runway protection zones, they had looked at improving the instrument approach procedures to the runway. The FAA is putting increased emphasis on keeping RPZs as clear as possible from incompatible uses such as churches, residences, and schools. He displayed information about different scenarios. In reply to a question from Commissioner Celigoy he confirmed that the FAA makes a distinction between precision based navigation procedures and ground based approach systems.

Turning to landside considerations, Mr. Quick said that they focused on predicting growth for the next 20 years. They predict continued growth in all aviation categories. They believe the Airport needs to cater to large aircraft while maintaining facilities to accommodate smaller aircraft. He outlined three development options, paying particular attention to the west side of the Airport.

Mr. Quick briefly discussed land acquisition possibilities to enlarge the footprint of the Airport. There is a little land east of the Airport that is vacant, but most of the other parcels have some commercial or industrial development in place. Mr. Mascaro added that two vacant parcels totaling approximately 11 acres have recently been bought by the same company.

At the Planning Advisory Committee meeting the previous day, Mr. Quick said that the discussion was lively and thoughtful. Some of the comments were about potential improvements to the taxiway geometry. The FBOs and staff from the control tower were in attendance and came up with suggestions to improve the geometry without relocating the taxiways. Pilots had input on the potential removal of the displaced thresholds and the improved instrument approach procedures. Committee members were interested in implementing a self-serve fuel facility. Additional hangar facilities for small aircraft by Kilo ramp were another topic of interest. Another PAC meeting is planned as they move into the final phase.

Chairman Ziomek thanked Mr. Quick and Mr. Harris for their presentation. Mr. Quick noted that all the information about the Master Plan is on the Airport website. He undertook to send the PowerPoint presentation to staff for distribution to the Commission. If they have questions he said the Commissioners should either send them through staff or contact Coffman Associates directly.

Vice Chairman Casey suggested devoting an entire special meeting to this topic in future. Mr. Mascaro said that is the purpose of the PAC. He added that the entire draft Master Plan will be brought to the Commission as the next step. Anyone who wishes is welcome to attend PAC meetings.

Commissioner Celigoy asked the consultants if they could comment on noise studies in general and give the Commission any guidance for dealing with future applications. Mr. Harris said he

has not seen the Bahia noise study. However, there are standards. Coffman Associates was involved in the Part 150 noise study. The DNL contours represent an annual average condition which includes a certain number of operations on an average daily basis and factors in the flow of traffic. Mr. Mascaro said there is no requirement as to when noise studies are conducted.

5. Discussion and Possible Action to Modify the Airport Advisory Commission Meeting Schedule and Commission Item Calendar

Nothing noted.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Commissioner Hobbi suggested that when hearings about developments in the Airport influence area and the quarterly noise complaint report are both on the agenda of a meeting, the agenda should be reordered so that applicants and any members of the public can hear discussion of the noise complaints.

.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, being duly moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

Recorded and Transcribed by AVTronics Inc., d/b/a AVTranz Transcription and Reporting Services